

Changing Campus Culture: A Policy Scan of Campus Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Procedures on Ohio's Campuses

Sarah Hudacek¹

Advisors: Dr. Amanda Girth² and Dr. Julianna Nemeth³

¹hudacek.3@osu.edu, ² John Glenn College of Public Affairs, girth.1@osu.edu, ³ College of Public Health, nemeth.37@osu.edu



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Introduction

Prevalence of Campus Sexual Violence:

- 1 in 5 women and 1 in 16 men will be assaulted during college (Krebs et al., 2016; U.S. Dept. of Education, OCR, 2011)
- Only 20 percent of campus sexual assaults are reported to authorities (DeMatteo et al., 2015)
- Only 27 percent of women believed their assault met the legal definition for rape (DeMatteo et al., 2015)

Research Question:

To what extent have Ohio universities complied with the recommendations set forth in the Ohio Department of Higher Education's "Changing Campus Culture" report, as codified in institutional policy?

Report Background:

- Over 100 sexual assaults on Ohio campuses in 2013
- \$2 million allocated to ODHE to develop best practices
- October 2015: "Changing Campus Culture" report released
- Opt-in initiative: 81% of Ohio institutions participated ("Changing Campus Culture: Background," 2016)

Importance of Policy:

- Ensure accountability, promote awareness, increase transparency
- Policy analyses highlight hidden assumptions and unintended consequences of policy practices (Wooten & Mitchell, 2016)

Report Recommendations:

1. Use data to guide action
2. Evidence-based training to empower campus community
3. Communicate a culture of shared respect and responsibility
4. Develop a comprehensive response policy
5. Adopt a survivor-centered response (ODHE, 2015).

Methodology

Data Collection

- Two sets of policy scans were completed: April and Sept. 2016
- Data set: Title IX and Sexual Misconduct policies
- 14 public institutions and 14 private institutions (> 2,500 students)
- Policies obtained Feb. 1, 2016 and Sept. 1, 2016
- Only official policies considered. Information listed on webpages excluded

Table 1: Coding Key	
2	Addresses recommendation in full
1	Partially addresses recommendation
0	Does not address recommendation

Results

Private Institutions Experienced Greater Positive Growth in Compliance from Spring 2016 to Fall 2016

Table 2: Minimum Compliance Results by Recommendation for Public and Private Institutions	Public (n=14)			Private (n=14)		
	Compliance with ODHE recommendations as reflected in campus policy		Percent Change ((Spring n - Fall n)/Spring n) * 100	Compliance with ODHE recommendations as reflected in campus policy		Percent Change ((Spring n - Fall n)/Spring n) * 100
	Spring n (%)	Fall n (%)		Spring n (%)	Fall n (%)	
Recommendation 1: Using data to guide action	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0%	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	-100%
1a. Annual climate survey	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	-100%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0%
1b. Measure effectiveness of all programs	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0%	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	-100%
Recommendation 2: Evidence-based training	10 (71%)	9 (64%)	-10%	6 (43%)	8 (57%)	33%
2a. Training program addresses multiple stakeholders	9 (64%)	9 (64%)	0%	6 (43%)	9 (64%)	49%
2b. Program uses feedback from climate survey	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	-100%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0%
Recommendation 3: Culture of respect and responsibility	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	-33%	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	0%
Recommendation 4: Comprehensive response protocol	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	0%	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	0%
Recommendation 5: Adopt a survivor-centered response	13 (93%)	13 (93%)	0%	13 (93%)	14 (100%)	8%

As Table 2 demonstrates:

- Only private institutions in Ohio saw positive growth from Spring to Fall
- Public and private compliance rates are comparable

Institutional Policies Regressed from Spring 2016 to Fall 2016

Table 3: Minimum Compliance Results by Recommendation for All Institutions	All Institutions (n=28)		
	Compliance with ODHE recommendations as reflected in campus policy		Percent Change ((Spring n - Fall n)/Spring n) * 100
	Spring n (%)	Fall n (%)	
Recommendation 1: Using data to guide action	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	-43%
1a. Annual climate survey	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	-100%
1b. Measure effectiveness of all programs	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	-43%
Recommendation 2: Evidence-based training	16 (57%)	17 (61%)	7%
2a. Training program addresses multiple stakeholders	15 (54%)	18 (64%)	19%
2b. Program uses feedback from climate survey	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	-100%
Recommendation 3: Culture of respect and responsibility	5 (18%)	4 (14%)	-22%
Recommendation 4: Comprehensive response protocol	28 (100%)	28 (100%)	0%
Recommendation 5: Adopt a survivor-centered response	26 (93%)	27 (96%)	3%

As Table 3 demonstrates:

- The recommendations experiencing positive growth from Spring to Fall were:
 - Recommendation 2: Providing evidence-based training
 - Recommendation 2a: Training program that addresses multiple stakeholders
 - Recommendation 5: Adopting a survivor-centered response
- Only Recommendation 4 saw 100% compliance

Recommendations With Greatest Positive Change:

- Recommendation 5: Confidential advisor (+6 institutions)
- Recommendation 5: Victim advocate (+2 institutions)
- Recommendation 2: Trauma-informed training (+2 institutions)
- Recommendation 2: Bystander Intervention training (+1 institution)
- Recommendation 2: Self-protection training (+1 institution)

Recommendations With Highest Compliance:

- Recommendation 4: Developing a comprehensive response policy (100%)
- Recommendation 5: Adopting a survivor-centered response (96%)

Discussion

None of the 28 institutions analyzed had fully complied with the recommendations set forth in the Ohio Department of Higher Education's "Changing Campus Culture" report, as of Fall 2016.

In fact, only 13 of the 28 institutions scanned changed their policies in any way from Spring 2016 to Fall 2016.

Little Institutional Policy Change from Spring to Fall

Table 4: Institutional Policy Change from Spring 2016 to Fall 2016	Institutions With At Least One Policy Changed from Spring to Fall n (%)
Public (n=14)	5 (36%)
Private (n=14)	8 (57%)
All Institutions (n=28)	13 (46%)

Policy Weaknesses:

- Policy regression
- Broken hyperlinks
- Outdated policies
- Misspellings and grammatical errors
- Vague, unspecific policy statements
- Difficult to access from search engines

Conclusion:

- There is a need for substantial improvement in the incorporation of ODHE's recommendations into policies for higher education institutions in Ohio

Implications:

- Policies are frequently up for review and re-negotiation. Institutions can use the results of this analysis to improve their prevention and response policies
- The State of Ohio can use these results to explore strategies to support institutions in the fight against sexual violence

Limitations:

- Initial policies downloaded four months after report released
- Subjectivity of policy scan method

Future Research Opportunities:

- Barriers to implementation of recommendations
- State-by-state comparison of best practices
- A survey of students' perception of campus culture at each institution

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my advisors, Dr. Girth and Dr. Nemeth, for their endless time, support and advice to make this project possible.

*References available as supplemental document